

GUIDANCE MEMORANDUM #3



Plan Maintenance Procedures: Monitoring, Evaluating and Updating the Plan

To: Terry Winters, Nassau County OEM
From: Anna Foley, URS
Date: January 4, 2006
Re: Nassau County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning Effort

DMA 2000:

The Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA 2000), also known as Public Law 106-390, amends the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act by, among other things, adding a new section, 322 - Mitigation Planning. It contains 44 CFR Part 201.6(c)(4)(i) which states, "[The plan maintenance process shall include a section describing the] method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle." A formal plan maintenance process must take place to ensure that the Hazard Mitigation Plan remains an active and pertinent document. Regularly scheduled evaluations (i.e., annually) during the five-year cycle are important to assess the effectiveness of the program and to reflect changes that may affect mitigation priorities.

The Requirement:

To meet the requirement of periodically monitoring, evaluating and updating the plan, the new hazard mitigation plan must present the criteria that will be used by the Planning Group to perform its annual evaluation and five-year update of the Plan. The plan should discuss specific plan update procedures, including what criteria will be used to evaluate the plan, what may trigger a plan update before the five-year minimum, who will lead the effort to update the document and under what time frame.

Memo Purpose:

This memorandum aims to present a summary of key information that is presented in FEMA's How-To Guide #3 entitled "Developing the Mitigation Plan; Identifying Mitigation Actions and Implementing Strategies" (available online at: http://www.fema.gov/fima/planning_howto3.shtm) and How-To Guide #4 entitled "Bringing the Plan to Life: Implementing the Hazard Mitigation Plan" (available online at: http://www.fema.gov/fima/planning_howto4.shtm). It is intended to serve as a supplement – and not as a replacement – for the FEMA documents. URS would strongly suggest that Planning Group members make every effort to familiarize themselves with applicable FEMA regulations and mitigation planning guidance (see "Sources of Information on Hazard Mitigation on Planning" handout from Core Planning Group Meeting #1 on November 14, 2005 and the PowerPoint Presentation handout from PGM1 on October 20, 2005).



Keep In Mind:

URS Corporation (URS), as the consulting company, is able to provide the Planning Group with guidance on potential means to satisfy the requirement for plan maintenance procedures. However, it is Nassau County and the participating jurisdictions that are in the best position to define the process. The Planning Group must coordinate amongst themselves to consider URS' recommendations herein and agree upon a plan maintenance procedure for the County's Multi-Jurisdictional Plan, to be provided back to URS in order for URS to incorporate this information into the plan. URS will incorporate the plan maintenance procedures, obtained from the Planning Group, into the new Hazard Mitigation Plan. A response is requested by close of business on January 31, 2006.

Action Items:

Action items are discussed further throughout this memorandum. They are presented in summary here. To allow URS sufficient time to draft appropriate plan sections, the Planning Group must:

- Provide URS with a response regarding the plan maintenance procedures by close of business on January 31, 2006.



Section 1 – Monitoring

The Regulations: 44 CFR §201.6(c)(4)(i) states, *"[The plan maintenance process shall include a section describing the] method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle."*

An important step in any mitigation planning process is to document the method by which the Planning Group will monitor the Hazard Mitigation Plan throughout the five-year period of record. For instance, the Planning Group should describe the monitoring system it has established to oversee the new plan. Examples include:

1. Periodic work progress reports by agencies or Planning Group members involved in implementing projects or activities;
2. Site visits, phone calls and meetings conducted by the individual responsible for overseeing the plan; and
3. Preparation of an annual report that will summarize the scope of the plan and the milestones of the activities above-mentioned.

Statements like the ones above should be accompanied by additional details such as how, when, and by whom monitoring activities shall be conducted.

As mentioned in item number 1 above, agencies, departments, organizations and/or individual members, whose duties have been identified in the mitigation strategy, can be asked to periodically submit a work progress report on those projects being implemented. The plan should include specific details such as: whether this 'periodic' action is to be conducted annually, semi-annually, quarterly, or over some other time frame, making note of specific due dates; responsible parties who will be completing the progress reports; to whom progress reports shall be submitted; the individual or individuals who will be reviewing the progress reports (and when); and how this information will be incorporated. The progress report should include:

1. The hazard mitigation action(s) that the agency is responsible for;
2. The supporting agencies/entities responsible for implementation;
3. A delineation of the various stages of work along with timelines (milestones should be included);
4. Whether the resources needed for implementation, funding, staff time and technical assistance are available, or if other arrangements must be made to obtain them;
5. The types of permits or approvals necessary to implement the action;
6. Details on the ways the actions will be accomplished within the organization;
7. Whether the duties will be assigned to agency staff or contracted out;
8. The current status of the project; and
9. The identification of any issues that may hinder implementation.

This method of providing progress reports helps break the process into smaller, more manageable tasks. The plan maintenance process is an ongoing activity; thus, periodic review of the plan will help keep the plan current, reflecting the changing needs of the community. URS would suggest that the Planning Group review the sample worksheet "Progress Report" on pages 2-13 through 2-15 of FEMA's How-To Guide #4 which can be utilized as a tool in the monitoring and documentation process of the plan (see Attachment A for a blank template of the report).

It is recommended that the Planning Group establish Key Performance Indicators (KPI's) that measure the effectiveness of the projects and of those involved in the projects so that team members better understand how their



actions contribute to the overall success of the projects. When identifying the Planning Group's KPI's, quantifiable measurements, it is critical to limit them to the areas under discussion that are essential to the Planning Group successfully reaching its goals. Thus, KPI's should be directly tied to the goals and objectives of the plan and the projects, and should be used as a performance management tool.

KPI's assist the team members by providing a clear focus of what's important and what needs to be accomplished. URS would suggest that the Planning Group review the sample worksheet "Evaluate Your Projects Results" on pages 3-6 through 3-7 of FEMA's How-To Guide #4 which can be utilized as a tool in the project evaluation process of the plan (see Attachment B for a blank template of the worksheet).

Section 2 – Evaluation

The Regulations: 44 CFR §201.6(c)(4)(i) states, *"[The plan maintenance process shall include a section describing the] method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle."*

Post adoption and implementation, a mitigation plan should be evaluated on an annual basis in order to assess the effectiveness of the plan and to reflect changes that may affect the mitigation priorities. It should include the criteria that will be utilized to evaluate the plan, for example:

1. Do the goals and objectives address current and expected conditions;
2. Has the nature and magnitude of risks changed;
3. Are the current resources appropriate for implementing the plan;
4. Are there any implementation problems (such as technical, political and/or legal), or coordination issues with the other agencies and/or Planning Group members;
5. Have the outcomes occurred as expected;
6. Whether the agencies and other Planning Group partners participated, as proposed; and
7. Where shortcomings are identified, and what can be done to bring things back on track?

Statements like the ones above should be accompanied by additional details such as how, when, and by whom evaluation activities shall be conducted.

The Planning Group may choose to meet on an annual basis to discuss monitoring results, and to evaluate progress according to specific criteria.

Attachment C includes a blank template of FEMA's "Revise the Plan" worksheet (from How-To #4). Annual evaluations using this worksheet may be helpful to determine whether a full update (in advance of the five-year minimum) would be useful.



Section 3 – Update

The Regulations: 44 CFR §201.6(c)(4)(i) states, “[The plan maintenance process shall include a section describing the] method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle.”

44 CFR §201.6(d)(3) states, “Plans must be reviewed, revised if appropriate, and resubmitted for approval within five years in order to continue to be eligible for HMGP Project grant funding.”

As stated in the above regulations, the plan must be reviewed and revised (if needed), by the local jurisdiction and resubmitted to the State Hazard Mitigation Officer for initial review and coordination within five years of the plan's approval by FEMA. This is the minimum required. The Planning Group may choose to update more frequently, on an as-needed basis. The plan should identify what may trigger plan updates before the minimum five-year window. It should also identify the specific update procedures, the responsible individual(s) for updating the document, and the specific timelines.

URS suggests that Mr. Terence Winters, Director of Emergency Planning, who was identified as Chairperson of the Nassau County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning Group, may be a good candidate for overseeing the monitoring, evaluation and updating process, and the County Planning Commission may be a good candidate for taking the lead on plan updates. The plan must be updated and revised, at a minimum, every five years in order to keep the Mitigation Plan relevant and meet DMA 2000 requirements.

Section 4 – Public Participation in Plan Maintenance

The Regulations: 44 CFR Part 201.6(c)(4)(iii) states, “[The plan maintenance process shall include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.”

To meet this requirement, the new Hazard Mitigation Plan should describe what opportunities the public and other stakeholders will have during the plan's periodic review to comment on the progress made to date and on any proposed plan revisions.

Note that this is a separate issue from the public's participation to-date in plan *development*. The plan must also discuss specific procedures for how the Planning Group will invite the public to participate in *future* plan monitoring, evaluating, and updating. Will the Planning Group send an annual newsletter out to the public, with a survey form to fill out? Will the Planning Group hold annual public meetings to discuss the status of the plan recommendations? What process will be in place for public comments to be incorporated into future plan updates?

The following pages provide action item suggestions that the Planning Group could consider for selection as opportunities for continued participation on the part of the public and other stakeholders. The Planning Group



members should select items that they feel are most appropriate and provide feedback to URS on what was selected as a final course of action to be incorporated into the plan.

Continued Public Involvement in Plan Maintenance

URS recommends that the Planning Group pursue a wide array of activities to involve the public during future plan monitoring, evaluating, and updates. Options include but are not limited to:

- **Share the findings of future progress reports** with interested groups, elected officials, neighborhood representatives and citizens as one way to keep the parties informed and involved. This could be done by posting progress reports in local libraries, clerk's offices, web sites, etc. Furthermore, this keeps those responsible for implementing the mitigation actions motivated.
- Conduct **town hall meetings**, which are an effective way to bring citizens and Planning Group members together to learn about the progress being made on the plan;
- Provide **facilitated meetings**. An experienced facilitator would assist with the process of obtaining public opinions, suggestions and other pertinent information relevant to the goals and objectives of the plan.
- Provide the public with **surveys** that assess how well the public education and outreach projects are working and how the community perceives the planning efforts. Samples are included in the FEMA How-To's. Questionnaires/surveys are excellent tools to assist the Planning Group in obtaining valuable feedback on the plan. By their nature, questionnaires also provide recipients with an excellent vehicle to provide comments.

Once the Planning Group has gathered the feedback from the general public and local community, URS suggests organizing the data by topic, by types of responses and suggestions or by Planning Group members' related tasks in the plan. This will facilitate the process of incorporating the feedback into the plan.

One method of organizing the data is to build a database that would contain community member/general public responses to the plan and the surveys. This data could then be used to conduct statistical analyses by topic (such as land use or environment); calculate total numbers in support of or against policies of the mitigation process; and gather suggestions and comments regarding the natural hazards, among other concerns that may arise out of the public's awareness.

- Offer **working groups** or advisory groups by topic areas such as land use, environmental protection and transportation;
- Conduct planned or impromptu **interviews** with community members and publicize their comments;
- Use the **media** to inform the public of the plan, through press releases, handing out flyers, newsletters or placing local ads on TV, and in newspapers and magazines;
- Offer **telephone hotline services** (preferably a toll-free number).
- Establish an **online presence** with a Web site or the use of an existing Web site of the participating jurisdiction members. The easy accessibility to a Web site that the public can access at any time to read about the latest natural hazards or obtain the latest hazard mitigation planning information is an excellent method of keeping the public involved and informed on a continuous basis. For instance, the Planning Group could provide a section where the community can fill-out questionnaires as well as email Planning Group members with issues or success stories. Additionally, by offering online services, the general public could:
 - participate in message boards on the site (open to all for comments on specific mitigation topics);
 - review meeting minutes and notes;
 - review the Plan itself;
 - follow links to natural hazards information;
 - fill out online surveys and questionnaires;



- obtain contact information for key persons involved in the mitigation planning process; and
- vote on various mitigation-related issues, questions, processes, goals, objectives, etc.

Opportunities selected by the Planning Group for public participation in plan maintenance should be very specific in terms of: exactly *when* these opportunities will be available; *how* the public will be notified of their opportunity to participate; where the plan and any progress reports, meeting minutes, etc. will be maintained for review, how and to whom comments can be submitted.

Statements “that” certain things will happen are not sufficient in themselves to meet FEMA criteria. Details must be provided to show that a process has been clearly thought out and identified. For example, stating “that the public will be invited to participate in future plan monitoring, evaluation, and updates” is not sufficient. Additional information should be included so that the reader knows how and when members of the public will be invited to participate; what they will be invited to do (i.e., an annual meeting? A questionnaire or survey?); how and when they will be notified of this opportunity; how they can submit comments; what will be done with their comments. In our opinion, it would be more important to have a few, well thought out options defined in detail than a multitude of options defined only in part. If participating jurisdictions have public outreach persons on staff, it may be a good idea for the Planning Group to consider soliciting their support.

Section 5 – Key Points and Some Examples

Key Points to Consider

The two simple questions that the Planning Group should ensure are answered in the plan are:

1. Does the plan describe the method for monitoring, evaluating and updating the plan? (i.e., department/staff responsible for monitoring, criteria for evaluation and department/staff responsible for updating).
2. Does the plan describe a schedule for monitoring, evaluating and updating the plan within the five-year cycle?

Each participating jurisdiction should have a role in the process of monitoring, evaluating and updating the plan. One way to obtain this input would be to require that each participating jurisdiction complete each of Attachments A through C and submit to Nassau County Office of Emergency Management in October of each year.

Some Examples

The excerpts below are samples of acceptable text for plan monitoring, evaluating and updating, as taken from FEMA’s Interim Criteria, Part 3 – Local Mitigation Plans, Page 3-45, and from the Hazard Mitigation Plan for Atlantic City, New Jersey (Section VIII, Plan Maintenance, September 2004).

FEMA’s Sample

“Rocky County has developed a method to ensure that regular review and update of the Hazard Mitigation Plan occurs. The County has formed a Hazard Mitigation Plan Evaluation Committee that consists of members from local agencies and other concerned parties, including elected officials, the County Department of Natural Resources, the County Office of Economic Development, the County Office of Emergency Services, the County DOT, the non-profit Mud River Watershed Society, and representatives from the State University Geography Department. The County Planning Department is responsible for contacting committee members and organizing the annual meeting. The meeting will be held in March of each year, and committee members will be responsible for monitoring and evaluating the progress of the mitigation strategies into the plan.”



The Committee will review each goal and objective to determine their relevance to changing situations in the County, as well as changes in State or Federal policy, and to ensure that they are addressing current and expected conditions. The committee will also review the risk assessment portion of the plan to determine if this information should be updated or modified. The parties responsible for the various implementation actions will report on the status of their projects and will include which implementation processes worked well, any difficulties encountered, how coordination efforts were proceeding, and which strategies should be revised.

The Planning Department will then have three months to update and make changes to the plan before submitting it to the Committee members and the State Hazard Mitigation Officer. If no changes are necessary, the State Hazard Mitigation Officer will be given a justification for this determination."

Atlantic City, New Jersey Excerpt

"The Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA 2000), also known as Public Law 106-390, amends the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act by, among other things, adding a new section, 322 - Mitigation Planning. It contains 44 CFR Part 201.6(c)(4)(i) which states, "[The plan maintenance process shall include a section describing the] method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle." A formal plan maintenance process must take place to ensure that the Hazard Mitigation Plan remains an active and pertinent document. Regularly scheduled evaluations (i.e., annually) during the five-year cycle are important to assess the effectiveness of the program and to reflect changes that may affect mitigation priorities.

URS Corporation (URS), as the consulting company, was able to provide the Planning Committee with guidance on potential means to satisfy the requirement for plan maintenance procedures. However, it was the City of Atlantic City, New Jersey, and the members of the Planning Committee who were in the best position to define the process. URS submitted a Guidance Memorandum (Guidance Memorandum #2, see Appendix B) to the Committee on March 2, 2004. Members of the Committee met on a conference call on March 11, 2004, to provide URS with their collective decisions in terms of Plan Maintenance: Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan. The information below represents these decisions, as provided to URS. These methods will ensure that regular review and updating of the Hazard Mitigation Plan will occur.

The Committee has selected their Chairman, Mr. Tom Foley, Emergency Management Coordinator, Office of Emergency Management, as the key individual responsible for heading up the plan maintenance effort. He will be supported by a Plan Maintenance Subcommittee, identified to URS on March 11, 2004, as the following tentative subset of committee members who participated in the development of this Plan:

Mr. Tom Foley, ACOEM, Plan Maintenance Subcommittee Chairman

Mr. Allyn Seel, ACOEM

Mr. Keith Mills, Atlantic City Planning Department

Mr. Jerry Kilby, Atlantic City Engineering Department

Mr. Patrick Malia, Atlantic City Building Department

Mr. Steve Frame, Atlantic City Building Department

Mr. Foley is responsible for checking with individual availability, and for finalizing the Plan Maintenance Subcommittee by September 2004.

Monitoring the Plan

An important step in any mitigation planning process is to document the method by which the Committee will monitor the Hazard Mitigation Plan throughout the five-year period of record. The Committee has established the following monitoring system:

- 1. Work progress reports shall be prepared by agencies or Committee members responsible for implementing mitigation actions, and submitted to the Plan Maintenance Subcommittee Chairman in December of each year, beginning in the year 2004. Work progress reports shall be the FEMA How-To*



#4 (FEMA 386-4), Worksheet #1, Progress Report. (Progress reports will be distributed to the rest of the Subcommittee by the Chairman by March of each year, and will be reviewed by the Plan Maintenance Subcommittee in April of each year, beginning in April 2005, see the "Evaluating the Plan" section below for more details). Using the FEMA Progress Reports will answer the following questions:

- *the hazard mitigation action(s) that the agency is responsible for;*
 - *the supporting agencies/entities responsible for implementation;*
 - *a delineation of the various stages of work along with timelines (milestones should be included);*
 - *whether the resources needed for implementation, funding, staff time and technical assistance are available, or if other arrangements must be made to obtain them;*
 - *the types of permits or approvals necessary to implement the action;*
 - *details on the ways the actions will be accomplished within the organization;*
 - *whether the duties will be assigned to agency staff or contracted out;*
 - *the current status of the project; and*
 - *identifying any issues that may hinder implementation.*
2. *Site visits, phone calls and meetings will be conducted by the Plan Maintenance Subcommittee Chairman, on an as-needed basis or at a minimum of once per year (no later than February of each year, beginning in February 2005), with the agencies or Committee members responsible for implementing mitigation actions. This is intended to supplement the progress reports, to ensure that the Plan Maintenance Subcommittee Chairman is apprised of activities, and to keep responsible parties focused on moving forward with their responsibilities.*
3. *The Plan Maintenance Subcommittee Chairman, after reviewing all progress reports, will prepare an annual report that will summarize the scope of the Plan and the milestones of the activities above-mentioned, in March of each year, beginning in March 2005. The Chairman will distribute this report to the rest of the Subcommittee, also in March of each year. The Subcommittee will be responsible for familiarizing themselves with this information in time for their annual meetings in April of each year (see the "Evaluating the Plan" section below for more details).*

Evaluating the Plan

Post adoption, a mitigation plan should be evaluated on an annual basis in order to assess the effectiveness of the plan's implementation and to reflect changes that may affect the mitigation priorities.

In April of each year, the Plan Maintenance Subcommittee will hold one meeting to evaluate the plan. At this meeting, Subcommittee members will review Progress Reports and the Annual Report. They will use the following criteria to evaluate the plan:

- *Do the goals and objectives address current and expected conditions?*
- *Has the nature and magnitude of risks changed?*
- *Are the current resources appropriate for implementing the plan?*
- *Are there any implementation problems (such as technical, political and/or legal), or coordination issues with the other agencies and/or Committee members?*
- *Have the outcomes occurred as expected?*
- *Whether the agencies and other Committee partners participated as proposed; and*
- *Where shortcomings are identified, what can be done to bring things back on track?*

Following this meeting, the Plan Maintenance Subcommittee Chairman will prepare a report summarizing the outcome of the April evaluation meeting (this report should be submitted to all Subcommittee members in May of each year, beginning in May of 2005).



Updating the Plan

As per 44 CFR §201.6(d)(2) and 44 CFR §201.6(d)(3), the plan must be reviewed and revised (if needed), by the local jurisdiction and resubmitted to the State Hazard Mitigation Officer for initial review and coordination within five years of the plan's approval by FEMA.

The Plan Maintenance Subcommittee Chairman will use monitoring and evaluation reports to update the plan and submit to NJOEM and FEMA. Assuming that FEMA approves this Plan in 2004, it follows that the Chairman will need to update this Plan in the year 2009. The specific month of FEMA approval is not known at this time. However, the Chairman will be responsible for completing any necessary updates no later than one month prior to the five-year deadline. An update will be needed if changing situations have modified goals/objectives/actions, if additional information is available to perform more accurate vulnerability assessments, or if it is determined that the Plan no longer addresses current and expected future conditions. If it is determined by the Chairman that no updates are necessary, justification will be provided in writing to the NJOEM and FEMA.

Public Participation in Plan Maintenance

The Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA 2000), also known as Public Law 106-390, amends the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act by, among other things, adding a new section, 322 - Mitigation Planning. It contains 44 CFR Part 201.6(c)(4)(iii) which states, "[The plan maintenance process shall include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process." To meet this requirement, the new Hazard Mitigation Plan should describe what opportunities the public will have during the plan's periodic review to comment on the progress made to date and on any proposed plan revisions.

The following array of activities was selected by the Planning Committee during a conference call of March 11, 2004. During this call, the Chairman (Mr. Tom Foley) was identified as the responsible party. Mr. Foley will ensure that each of the following activities each occur at least once during this Plan's five year planning window (unless otherwise specified) and that activities undertaken will be included by the Chairman in the March annual reports.

- 1. Share the findings of future progress reports with interested groups, elected officials, neighborhood representatives and citizens to keep the parties informed and involved. This may be done by posting progress reports in local libraries, clerk's office, web sites, etc. Furthermore, it keeps those responsible for implementing the mitigation actions motivated.*
- 2. Conduct one public meeting per year, to bring citizens and Committee members together to learn about the progress being made on the Plan;*
- 3. Provide the general public with surveys on the ACOEM web site (web site currently under development) that assess how well the public education and outreach projects are working and how the community perceives the planning efforts. Questionnaires/surveys are excellent tools that assist the Committee in obtaining valuable feedback on the Plan.*
- 4. Conduct planned or impromptu interviews with the community and publicize their comments;*
- 5. Utilize the existing media to inform the public of the Plan, through such means as issuing press releases, handing out flyers, newsletters or placing local ads on TV, radio, in newspapers and magazines; and*
- 6. Offer telephone hotline services for more information on mitigation planning, similar to the Mayor's hotline currently available.*
- 7. Add Hazard Mitigation information links to the ACOEM web site (currently under development) to allow the public access at any time to read about the latest natural hazards or obtain the latest hazard*



mitigation planning information is an excellent method of keeping the public involved and informed on a continuous basis. Information to be posted can include, but may not be limited to:

- *Meeting minutes and notes;*
- *The Plan itself;*
- *Links to natural hazards information;*
- *Online surveys and questionnaires; and*
- *Contact information for key persons involved in the mitigation planning process (readers will be referred to Mr. Tom Foley, Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee Chairman and Plan Maintenance Committee Chairman, Emergency Management Coordinator, Office of Emergency Management, Public Safety Building, 2715 Atlantic Avenue, 4th Floor, Atlantic City, New Jersey 08401).*

Again, Mr. Foley will ensure that each of the following activities each occur at least once during this Plan's five year planning window (unless otherwise specified), which is expected to end in the year 2009, and that activities undertaken will be included by the Chairman in the March annual reports."



ATTACHMENT A

FEMA's How-To Guide #4, "Bringing the Plan to Life: Implementing the Hazard Mitigation Plan"

Worksheet #1, Progress Report

Pages 1 through 3



Worksheet # 1: Progress Report

Progress Report Period: _____ to _____
(date) (date)

Project Title: _____ Project ID#: _____

Responsible Agency: _____

Address: _____

City/County: _____

Contact Person: _____ Title: _____

Phone #(s): _____ e-mail address: _____

List Supporting Agencies and Contacts: _____

Total Project Cost: \$ _____ Anticipated Cost Overrun/Underrun: _____

Date of Project Approval: _____ Start date of the project: _____

Anticipated completion date: _____

Description of the Project (include a description of each phase, if applicable, and the time frame for completing each phase).

Milestones	Complete	Projected Date of Completion



Plan Goal(s)/Objective(s) Addressed:

Goal: _____

Objective: _____

Indicator of Success (e.g., losses avoided as a result of the acquisition program):

In most cases, you will list losses avoided as the indicator. In cases where it is difficult to quantify the benefits in dollar amounts, you will use other indicators, such as the number of people who now know about mitigation or who are taking mitigation actions to reduce their vulnerability to hazards.

Status (Please check pertinent information and provide explanations for items with an asterisk. For completed or canceled projects, see Worksheet #2 — to complete a project evaluation):

Project Status

(1) ☐ Project on schedule

(2) ☐ Project completed

(3) ☐ Project delayed*

*explain: _____

(4) ☐ Project canceled

Project Cost Status

(1) ☐ Cost unchanged

(2) ☐ Cost overrun*

*explain: _____

(3) ☐ Cost underrun*

*explain: _____

Summary of progress on project for this report:

- A. What was accomplished during this reporting period?
- B. What obstacles, problems, or delays did you encounter, if any?
- C. How was each problem resolved?

Next Steps: What is/are the next step(s) to be accomplished over the next reporting period?

Other comments:

Adapted from the North Carolina HMGP Progress Report Form at
http://www.dem.dcc.state.nc.us/mitigation/document_index.htm.



ATTACHMENT B

FEMA's How-To Guide #4, "Bringing the Plan to Life: Implementing the Hazard Mitigation Plan"

Worksheet #3, Evaluate Your Project Results

Pages 3-6 through 3-7



Worksheet #3: Evaluate Your Project Results

Project Name and Number:	<p><i>Insert location map</i></p> <p><i>include before and after photos if appropriate</i></p>
Project Budget:	
Project Description:	
Associated Goal and Objective (s):	
Indicator of Success (e.g., losses avoided):	

Was the action implemented?

IF YES



What were the results of the implemented action?

Why not?

IF NO



Was there political support for the action?	YES	NO
Were enough funds available?	YES	NO
Were workloads equitably or realistically distributed?	YES	NO
Was new information discovered about the risks or community that made implementation difficult or no longer sensible?	YES	NO
Was the estimated time of implementation reasonable?	YES	NO
Were sufficient resources (for example staff and technical assistance) available?	YES	NO



Were the outcomes as expected? YES NO Additional comments or other outcomes:

If No, please explain:

Did the results achieve the goal and objective (s)? YES NO
Explain how:

Was the action cost-effective? YES NO
Explain how or how not:

What were the losses avoided after having completed the project?

If it was a structural project, how did it change the hazard profile?

Date _____

Prepared by: _____



ATTACHMENT C

FEMA's How-To Guide #4, "Bringing the Plan to Life: Implementing the Hazard Mitigation Plan"

Worksheet #5, Revise the Plan

Pages 4-7 through 4-10



Worksheet #5: Revise the Plan

Prepare to update the plan.

When preparing to update the plan:

Check the box when addressed ✓

1. Gather information, including project evaluation worksheets, progress reports, studies, related plans, etc.

☐

Comments:

2. Reconvene the planning team, making changes to the team composition as necessary (see results from *Worksheet #2*).

☐

Comments:

Consider the results of the evaluation and new strategies for the future.

When examining the community consider:

Check the box when addressed ✓

1. The results of the planning and outreach efforts.

☐

Comments:

2. The results of the mitigation efforts.

☐

Comments:

3. Shifts in development trends.

☐

Comments:

4. Areas affected by recent disasters.

☐

Comments:

5. The recent magnitude, location, and type of the most recent hazard or disaster.

☐

Comments:

6. New studies or technologies.

☐

Comments:

7. Changes in local, state, or federal laws, policies, plans, priorities, or funding.

☐

Comments:



8. Changes in the socioeconomic fabric of the community.

☐

Comments:

9. Other changing conditions.

☐

Comments:

Incorporate your findings into the plan.

When examining the plan:

Check the box when addressed ✓

1. Revisit the risk assessment.

☐

Comments:

2. Update your goals and strategies.

☐

Comments:

3. Recalculate benefit-cost analyses of projects to prioritize action items.

☐

Comments:

Use the following criteria to evaluate the plan:

Criteria

YES NO Solution

Are the goals still applicable?

--	--	--

Have any changes in the state or community made the goals obsolete or irrelevant?

--	--	--

Do existing actions need to be reprioritized for implementation?

--	--	--

Do the plan's priorities correspond with state priorities?

--	--	--

Can actions be implemented with available resources?

--	--	--

Comments:

